

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to express their appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided, for the indication that the drawings are acceptable, for the acknowledgement of Applicants' claim of priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document, and for the acknowledgement of Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement by return of the Form PTO-1449.

Applicants also acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claims 7 and 8 contain allowable subject matter on page 6 of the Official Action.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-8 are currently pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of all the claims pending in the present application.

On pages 2-4 of the Official Action, claims 1, 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FUJIMOTO et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,391,457).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1 includes inter alia, "An electronic still camera comprising: a photographing optical system; an image pick-up device; and a transmission optical component; wherein light rays of an object which are passed through said photographing optical system are incident on a sensor surface of said image pick-up device through said transmission optical component".

As an initial matter, and as acknowledged by the Examiner, Applicants note that FUJIMOTO et al. lacks any disclosure of *an electronic still camera* as recited in claim 1. In this regard, Applicants note that FUJIMOTO et al. is directed to an image sensor module for devices such as a digital camera, a mobile phone, or a camera indicated watch (note column 1, lines 9-12). Applicants further submit that it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to implement the image sensor module of FUJIMOTO et al. in an electronic still camera.

Applicants further submit that FUJIMOTO et al. lacks any disclosure of a *photographing optical system* and a *separate transmission optical component* as recited in claim 1. In this regard, Applicants submit that the lens member 3A in FUJIMOTO et al. (which the Examiner designates as the photographing optical system) and the lens portion 31 of lens member 3A in FUJIMOTO et al. (which the Examiner designates as the transmission optical component), which are in fact the same single lens member 3A, are clearly not *a separate photographing optical system and a separate transmission optical component*.

Applicants further note that the Examiner has provided no reasoned statement regarding the lack of this claimed subject matter in FUJIMOTO et al. Applicants further submit that it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of FUJIMOTO et al. to include a separate photographing optical system and a separate transmission optical component.

Claim 1 further includes inter alia, “wherein said transmission optical component is shaped so as to shift an image point of an object image formed through said photographing optical system rearwards with respect to said photographing optical system”.

Applicants submit that FUJIMOTO et al. lacks any disclosure of *a transmission optical component which is shaped so as to shift an image point of an object image formed through a photographing optical system rearwards with respect to the photographing optical system*. In this regard, Applicants submit that the lens portion 31 of lens member 3A in FUJIMOTO et al. (which the Examiner designates as the transmission optical component) is not shaped so as to shift an image point of an object image formed through the lens member 3A in FUJIMOTO et al. (which the Examiner designates as the photographing optical system) rearwards with respect to the lens member 3A in FUJIMOTO et al. Applicants believe that the Examiner's apparent confusion regarding this claimed feature is a result of his attempt to characterize the single lens member 3A as being both a separate photographing optical system and a separate transmission optical component, as noted above.

Applicants further note that the Examiner has provided no reasoned statement regarding the lack of this claimed subject matter in FUJIMOTO et al. Applicants further submit that it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of FUJIMOTO et al. to include a transmission optical component shaped to shift an image point of an object image formed through a photographing optical system rearwards with respect to the photographing optical system.

Claim 1 further includes inter alia, "wherein said transmission optical component includes a concave lens surface having a negative optical power".

Applicants submit that FUJIMOTO et al. lacks any disclosure of *a transmission optical component which includes a concave lens surface having a negative optical power*. In this regard, Applicants note that the concave region 30b in FUJIMOTO et al. (which the Examiner points out) is a surface of the lens member 3A (which the Examiner

designates as the photographing optical system) and not a surface of the lens portion 31 (which the Examiner designates as the transmission optical component). Accordingly, even under the Examiner's own characterization of the reference, there is clearly not a *concave lens surface having a negative optical power* on the transmission optical component (lens portion 31). Applicants believe that the Examiner's apparent confusion regarding this claimed feature is a result of his attempt to characterize the single lens member 3A as being both a separate photographing optical system and a separate transmission optical component, as noted above.

Applicants further note that the Examiner has provided no reasoned statement regarding the lack of this claimed subject matter in FUJIMOTO et al. Applicants further submit that it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of FUJIMOTO et al. to include a transmission optical component having a concave lens surface with a negative optical power.

Applicants further submit that dependent claims 4 and 5, which are at least patentable due to their dependency from claim 1, for the above-noted reasons, recite additional features of the invention and are also separately patentable over the prior art of record. For example, Applicants submit that FUJIMOTO et al. lacks any disclosure of a surface on the photographing optical system side of said transmission optical component (which the Examiner designates as lens portion 31) being a concave lens surface (as recited in claim 4). Applicants further submit that FUJIMOTO et al. lacks any disclosure of a transmission optical component (which the Examiner designates as lens portion 31) as comprising a concave lens having a concave surface on the sensor surface side (as recited in claim 5). Applicants believe that the Examiner's apparent confusion regarding the features recited in claims 4 and 5 is a result of his attempt to characterize the single

lens member 3A as being both a separate photographing optical system and a separate transmission optical component, as noted above.

Applicants further note that the Examiner has provided no reasoned statement regarding the lack of the subject matter recited in claims 4 and 5 in FUJIMOTO et al. Applicants further submit that it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of FUJIMOTO et al. to include the subject matter recited in claims 4 and 5.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) at least for each, and certainly for all, of the above-noted reasons, and an early indication of the allowance of claims 1, 4 and 5.

On pages 4 and 5 of the Official Action, claims 2 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FUJIMOTO et al. in view of various secondary references to KOBAYASHI (U.S. Patent No. 7,084,920) and HAMAMURA et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,700,617).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As an initial matter, Applicants submit that the teachings of KOBAYASHI and HAMAMURA et al. do not cure the above-noted deficiencies in the disclosure of FUJIMOTO et al. with regard to claim 1.

Applicants further submit that these dependent claims, which are at least patentable due to their dependency from claim 1, for the above-noted reasons, recite additional features of the invention and are also separately patentable over the prior art of record. In this regard, Applicants submit that the modifications suggested by the Examiner are based on impermissible hindsight reasoning, rather than on any teachings in

the references themselves, and would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) at least for each, and certainly for all, of the above-noted reasons, and an early indication of the allowance of all of the pending claims.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action, and allowance of the present application and all of the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

Applicants have made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believe that they have now done so.

Should there be any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Makoto MOGAMIYA, et al.



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

Daniel B. Moon
Reg. No. 48,214

October 16, 2008
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191
{P23811 00232937.DOC}